

## SECTION II—REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for a thorough review, and respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

### **Claims 1-19 and 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,127,524 to Renda et al. (“Renda”) in view of U.S. Patent 7,024,478 to Dalgic et al. (“Dalgic”). Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1, as amended herein, recites in pertinent part:

A method comprising ... attempting to authenticate the user device based on input received at the network login page; [and] **sending an unblock port command** to unblock the blocked port, when attempting to authenticate the user device **based on input received at the network login page** results in a positive authentication response ... .

The Office Action at page 3 concedes that Renda does not disclose a “block[ed] port,” but asserts that Dalgic cures the deficiency of Renda. As pointed out by the Office Action, Dalgic at column 6, lines 1-23 discloses “[i]f user authentication failes (204), the hub/switch **port is blocked.**” However, neither Renda or Dalgic teach or suggest “sending an unblock port command ... **based on input received at the network login page.**” Renda is silent with regard to this limitation, and Dalgic does not use “input received at the network login page ... to unblock the blocked port,” but rather, “receives the user’s authentication and billing information from the **PDA software,**” (col 5, lines 47-48) or alternatively, can “allow/disallow traffic from the **corresponding MAC addresses,**” (col 6, lines 30-31).

Because both Renda and Dalgic, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “sending an unblock port command ... based on input received at the network login page” as Applicants recite in amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the references and in condition for allowance. Independent claim 18, as amended, recites similar limitations. Dependent claims 2-16, 19, and 21-23 directly or indirectly incorporate all the limitations of the independent base claims upon which they depend. Thus, for at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-16, 19, and 21-23 are patentable over the references, and in condition for allowance. Claim 17 is canceled herein without prejudice, and thus, the rejection of claim 17 is rendered moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-16, 18-19, and 21-23.

## CONCLUSION

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked subject matter in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such subject matter may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (503) 439-8778.

### **Charge Deposit Account**

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

/Gregory D. Caldwell/  
Gregory D. Caldwell  
Registration No. 39,926  
Attorney for Applicants

Date: July 13, 2007

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP  
1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040

Phone: (503) 439-8778  
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073